1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

munication between the mother country and the colonies became increasingly difficult. Control was loosened, and laws for the benefit of the Indians were ignored. They became, indeed, an inferior majority, laboring as peons without hope of legal or social justice.[6]

Most of the Indians lost their land and labored on haciendas or in the mines. Some communities like Tlaxcala, having performed notable service to the Crown during the Conquest, kept their land although they had lost social status. Other groups, like the lake peoples of Xochimilco and Chalco, occupied territory which the Spaniards considered unsuitable for their own purposes. A fourth group lived relatively unmolested in primitive little villages tucked away in the mountains. These refugees had taken to the hills not only because of the white conquerors but also to avoid the rising Indian powers in the centuries before the Conquest. The several-score languages and dialects spoken in Mexico are preserved in these tiny villages where inhabitants are only lightly veneered with Christianity.

What remains of Indian culture today is largely the blend of early indigenous practices with the teachings of the friars in the sixteenth century. Yet the physical type and the languages have resisted absorption for four centuries. In Mexico there is hardly a group which remains as completely Indian as some of the North American tribes, but they, after all, have for the most part been conquered and put on reservations only in the last three generations. The groups who had earlier contact with the whites were exterminated many years ago.[7]

The Mexican Indians have endured and have done the work of Mexico for four centuries. They have seen the whites

16:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

This incident in Mexican history does not exhibit any features different from those found at the basis of tribal society, and it is not until the first decade of the sixteenth century that we are referred to the period when aboriginal institutions of ancient Mexico emerged from their former condition into that of political society proper and exhibited the features of rule as despotic as any on the three eastern continents. Even Robertson has so far yielded to this preconceived idea as to write, "This appearance of inconsistency has arisen from inattention to the innovations of Montezuma upon the Mexican policy. His aspiring ambition subverted the original system of government, and introduced a pure despotism. He disregarded the ancient laws, violated the privileges held most sacred, and reduced his subjects of every order to the level of slaves."[60] In general, many deeds, creditable and disreputable, are charged to that ill-starred "chief of men" of the Mexican tribe, whose tragical death has furnished a welcome topic to the most brilliant writers. "Wrathy chief" (Motecuzumah or Montezuma) was however innocent of many or of the most, if

seis parcialidades, que cada cual tiene sus barrios." This is indefinite and vague, and we are still left in doubt as to whether there were only six or whether there were more. The words "each of which has its quarters" would indicate that each of these "parcialidades" was divided into smaller ones. Still, "parcialidad" and "barrio" are regarded as equivalent terms, and both signify *kins*. The history of the capture of the Mexican pueblo has, in some details of the siege, preserved to us the names of some aboriginal "barrios" of Tlatiluico. *Vetancurt* (Vol. II, Part. III, Trat. II, cap. VII, p. 194) mentions two of them: "Yocacolco" (with the ermita of Santa-Ana) and "Amazac" (ermita of Santa Lucia), the latter of which is again named (Cap. X, p. 206) by him, and by Torquemada also. *Torquemada* gives a number of names even: Nonohualco (Lib. IV, cap. XCIII, pp. 551, 552), Yacocalco (p. 552), Tlacuchcalco (p. 552), Amazac, Coyonacazco (p. 552). This gives the names of five barrios of Tlatiluico. If to this we add "el Barrio, que se llama Xocotitlan, que es agora San Francisco, que por otro nombre se llama Cihuatecpan," (p. 552), we would have the sixth quarter also.

That the administration of Tlatiluico remained separate from that of Tenuchtitlan is proven by the fact that Montezuma was assisted by twenty chiefs corresponding to the twenty kins of the *Tenuchca only*, and without representation for the Tlatiluica. See *Bernal Diez de Castillo* (Cap. XCV, p. 95, Vedia II). But the war-chief of Tlatiluico was present at the council. Thus "Itzquauhtin" is frequently mentioned as the companion of Montezuma. *Sahagun* (Lib. XII, cap. XVI, p. 24; cap. XVII, p. 25; cap. XXI, p. 28; cap. XXIII, p. 31). *Torquemada* (Lib. IV, cap. LXX, pp. 498, 499). *Vetancurt* (Vol. II, cap. XV, Parte III, p. 132). *Clavigero* (Vol. II, Lib. IX, cap. XIX, p. 153).

Of the hatred between Mexicans proper and Tlatiluica the last days of the siege of Mexico furnish numerous instances. Both *Torquemada* (Lib. IV, cap. XCII, p. 550) and *Vetancurt* (Parte III, cap. VI of 3d Trat., p. 193) mention the flight of the former into Tlatiluico as taking refuge among enemies. Finally the following passage is sufficiently plain: *Duran* (Cap. XXXIV, p. 271), "E fué tanta la pertinacia de los Mexicanos, que hasta que los españoles vinieron á la tierra no les dejaron tornar á libertad ninguna, ni á tener templo particular."

[60] "*History of America*," (9th Edition, 1800, Vol. III, Book VII, p. 291).